

ER: 5-8904

| |
|--|
| Document No. _____ |
| No Change in Class. <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Declassified |
| Class. Changed To: TS S C |
| Auth.: NR 70-2 |
| Date: _____ By: _____ |

Training 3-3

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant Director for Personnel

SUBJECT : Career Development of Junior Personnel

REFERENCE : CIA Notice No. [REDACTED]

STATINTL

1. Conversations between this office and the Chief, Career Service Staff, have elicited evidence of a number of rather major alterations in the structure through which the referenced Notice will be implemented. These appear to be of sufficient fundamental importance that I cannot but chronicle them and at the same time ask if their content sufficiently alters the mechanics of selection for the program to warrant either a recasting of the enabling notice or an addendum to it:

a. We are advised that under Eligibility Criteria, paragraph 3.(b), of the subject notice, applications from personnel closest to the top age limit of 34 years will be given the most immediate attention, on the wholly understandable grounds that they will not have as many chances to qualify as the person who may be closer to the minimum age limit. As reasonable as this tactic may be in practice, it appears to raise the question of the wisdom of exciting the hopes and expectations of personnel in the younger groups, who will apply without knowledge that their cases will not, in all probability, be actively considered until a much later date. In this context, there is also the matter of the supervisory man hours that will be expended in assisting in the preparation of each individual case, with the result that a supervisor could devote considerable time to the preparation of material on someone, say under 30 years of age, whose case would not be taken up for many months, by which time there might have been considerable alteration in his basic Career Development Plan.

b. Also under Eligibility Criteria, paragraph 3.(d), we understand that, although the notice states: "[an individual must] have at least two years prior service with the Organization, preferably three," it is to be the practice that those persons with less than three years service will not be given consideration, reportedly because so many people

are applying. To my mind this constitutes a major alteration in the criteria, even though it is consistent with present requirements on eligibility for nomination to the Career Service. However, unless this matter is cleared up by amendment, many people with two years service will doubtless apply.

c. We also understand that the application of an individual certified to the Committee for Career Development of Junior Personnel, once considered by that group and not selected, is automatically reconsidered by the committee as many as four times, or once each quarter, without reactivation either by the individual or his Career Service Board. Then, after a fourth "failure to select" and apparently not before that time, the individual is to be notified of the reasons for his non-selection. This appears to mean that the applicant may go for as long as a year without word on his case, except for that which he can extrapolate by virtue of not having heard anything. The enabling notice appears to have resolved many of the questions surrounding a successful application, without having specified anything for those who, for one reason or another, including those I have cited in a. and b. above, have failed to be appointed.

d. Lastly, we understand that because of the large group of initial applications, it is likely that the appointments for the initial quarter under which the program functions will be considerably higher than those properly considered as belonging to that quarter. This would appear to open up the possibility that in any given year, the program would bankrupt itself of slots possibly as early as the half-way mark. For various reasons this may be the most expeditious way to handle the admission procedure, but it might be unfair to persons making application after the current year's slots had been used up. Therefore, might it not be better to make admission to the program an annual matter, covering, say, a period of two months, after which the rolls would be closed until the same period the following year?

2. While I firmly believe that valid experience can, and must, alter the shape of any of our regulatory issuances, I can not, for the same reason, fail to ignore the need for examining

ER: 5-8904

these changes as they occur so that any amendment consistent with good personnel management can be promptly made. Therefore, if these cited alterations in the selection process for the Career Development Program have been made, and if they are necessary, I suggest that suitable amendment be made in the printed material which is receiving the widest circulation today among all employees. In the light of the reported changes, it appears to me that the present notice, in effect, is soliciting applications from people who cannot yet be actively considered, under criteria which have been radically modified, for jobs that may already have been obligated. Your advice and comments are, therefore, earnestly requested.

15
LAWRENCE R. HOUSTON
Acting Deputy Director
(Administration)

SA-DD/A:JAC:dle (10 August 1974)

Distribution:

1 - chrono

✓ - subject